Date: Sat, 10 Apr 93 04:30:03 PDT
From: Packet-Radio Mailing List and Newsgroup <packet-radio@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Packet-Radio-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Packet-Radio@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Packet-Radio Digest V93 #95
To: packet-radio

Packet-Radio Digest Sat, 10 Apr 93 Volume 93 : Issue 95

Today's Topics:

Bit-Regenerator
Is this a valid Belgian call sign?
Network Switch
Plan the next generation BBS (2 msgs)
Pocket sized KISS compatible TNC
Possible to convert scanner to RO packet station?
RFD: rec.radio.amateur reorganization [discussion summary 3/31]
Rich Man's Packet ... : -) (2 msgs)
Shareware for the MFJ1278

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Packet-Radio@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Packet-Radio-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Packet-Radio Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/packet-radio".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Fri, 9 Apr 1993 16:17:20 +0000
From: pipex!bnr.co.uk!demon!fusk.demon.co.uk!dave@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Bit-Regenerator
To: packet-radio@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Apr7.183610.21481@ve6mgs.ampr.org> mark@ve6mgs.ampr.org writes:

>simply an 8 bit FIFO chip (as supplied on the TAPR G3RUH Modem). I

I'm interested to know what manufacturer/part this FIFO chip is please.

73, Dave
--
David Brooke

Over   dave@fusk.demon.co.uk   g6gzh@g6gzh.ampr.org
Cambridge   G6GZH @ GB7MHD

Date: Sat, 10 Apr 1993 00:52:23 GMT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!moe.ksu.ksu.edu!
hobbes.physics.uiowa.edu!news.iastate.edu!vlsi4!jvp@ames.arpa
Subject: Is this a valid Belgian call sign?
To: packet-radio@ucsd.edu

Hi,

  I was just contacted by a Belgian ham via postal mail. He wrote his
call sign as ONL4456. Can this be valid? The ON prefix looks right for
Belgium, but a four number suffix? And the length of the call sign is
seven characters! How would a call like this work in ax.25 which has
room for only six characters plus ssid? Do they run something different
than the standard ax.25 in Belgium?

+---+
| Jim Van Peursem - Ph.D. Student - Ham Radio -> KE0PH |
| Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Engineering |
| Iowa State University - Ames, IA 50011 |
| internet - jvp@iastate.edu -or- jvp@cpre1.ee.iastate.edu |
+---+

Date: 10 Apr 1993 07:16:46 GMT
From: usc!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!saimiri.primate.wisc.edu!
usenet.coe.montana.edu!news.u.washington.edu!stein2.u.washington.edu!
dbillon@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Network Switch
To: packet-radio@ucsd.edu

  I am looking for information about the Network Switches used in the US.

  I have heard about the PackeTen Switch. Are there other switches like this
one ?

  Thanks.

Damien, N7/FC1PLI, dbillon@u.washington.edu

Date: 9 Apr 93 17:31:33 GMT

From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: Plan the next generation BBS
To: packet-radio@ucsd.edu

Why wait for the next generation. First optimize the use of the LAN,
local messages need not be left on the central BBS. Second, smarten
up the use of the BBS by automating user connects. Treat the BBS and users
as a distributed system.
Such user software already exists and can be interfaced to existing BBSs
in the client (user) server (BBS) mode, or think of it as a front end to
the BBS. Try LAN-LINK. It can be FTP'd from ucsd.edu.

73 Joe G3ZCZ

Date: 9 Apr 93 22:31:48 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!nntp.Stanford.EDU!
abercrombie.Stanford.EDU!paulf@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Plan the next generation BBS
To: packet-radio@ucsd.edu

Next Generation? Linux/386BSD/Hurd on 386 boxes, running g protocol over
ax25, preferably on UHF, with VHF login lines, running a special hamnet.*
USEnet hierarchy. It's already happening.

-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "My boy, we are pilgrims in an unholy land."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Dr. Henry Jones Sr.

Date: Sat, 10 Apr 93 01:55:54 HKT
From: netcomsv!gnct!thomason@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Pocket sized KISS compatible TNC
To: packet-radio@ucsd.edu

swood@vela.acs.oakland.edu (Scott Wood) write:

`There is a company in Florida called PacComm that makes what is called

`a HandiPacket TNC which includes standard TNC2 commands, a Personal

`Message System electronic mailbox, and has KISS capabilities. It runs

`on batteries and has a good life there upon.

Thanks for you reply.

Do you know how much for a PacCom ?

Where is the Vendor's address ?

`Also if you are interested, I have the roms for the old HK-21 heath

`pocket packet on file from when Tasco picked up the line and expanded

`the PROMs to have KISS mode included. No documentation with it, and you

`have to do a software reset, else a hard reset from within.

I am new to packets.

What is HK-21 heath pocket packet ?

Where can I get it ant what is price ?

`I would be interested to know if you have any good places to get a

`Heath HK-21 fixed. (or a new one cheap) In the process of my testing and

`playing with mine, I broke the bus connections. When trying to fix that,

`I fried it somehow....

BTW, what do you think the best magazine is ?

`swood

73 DE VS6YHJ

thomason@gnct.com (thomason)
GloCom BBS - (852)4925025

Date: Fri, 9 Apr 1993 18:56:18 GMT
From: panix!msiso@nyu.arpa
Subject: Possible to convert scanner to RO packet station?
To: packet-radio@ucsd.edu

I'm intersted in getting into packet radio but am afraid of the cost and jumping right in. I curently own a scanner (of the handheld style) and was thinking that there must be some way to hook up the scanner to a PMP kinda deal to be able to recieve and watch the packet channels. I can do my own electronic work and would be willing to do scanner mods. Basically I'm looking for the cheapest way to convert a scanner to read only packet on my PC. Is there any hope?

Date: 9 Apr 93 23:53:51 GMT
From: pacbell.com!amdahl!amdahl!ikluft@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: RFD: rec.radio.amateur reorganization [discussion summary 3/31]
To: packet-radio@ucsd.edu

Andy.Warner@f716.n109.z1.his.com (Andy Warner) writes:
>ikluft@uts.amdahl.com (Ian Kluft) writes:
>> When you take out the undecided or unclear (unclear == one-liners not
>> expressing any opinion) comments, it's 2-to-1 in favor of the split.

>Or rather, 13 to 7 or 8 in real numbers. I think you'll be amazed at
>the number of folks waiting in the wings to vote a resounding NO (of
>course, I could be amazed by the number of folks just waiting to vote
>YES too..) I am singularly unmoved by the "it worked in rec.autos,
>rec.aviation etc arguments - is there a guerilla force that moves from
>group to group dreaming up splits ? Where to next ?

Good question - rephrased "where did this idea come from?" It came from the zillions of times we've seen large numbers of posts crying to split the newsgroup because the traffic level is too high. At the last large surge on that topic we invited anyone who wanted to participate in a mail list to determine if a split was needed and, if so, to come up with the RFD. The people who chose to participate in the mail list did exactly that.

You can download the transcript of the discusison from ftp.amdahl.com in
/pub/radio/amateur/rra-reorg.log.1.Z (160K+ uncompressed.) That's the same
directory where the FAQs can be found

>20 or 21 replies seems to me like a poor response for a request for
>a QSL route, let alone a reorg RFD.

Whoa!! You're changing the units on those numbers... those were 28 people in
an ongoing discussion on news.groups. That was a lot more than one "reply"
per person. To avoid any appearance of skewing the numbers, I presented the
numbers of people instead of the numbers of articles on each side. That way,
people can be very vocal and still only count once, no matter which side
they're on.

BTW, those numbers have grown significantly since then. The margin continues
to widen in favor of a split.

Considering how many people actually participate in discussions on news.groups,
these numbers are not insignificant. There will definitely be a CFV. Just
plan to vote when it arrives.
--
Ian Kluft KD6EUI PP-ASEL   Amdahl Corporation, Open Systems Development
ikluft@uts.amdahl.com   Santa Clara, CA
[disclaimer: any opinions expressed are mine only... not those of my employer]

Date: Fri, 09 Apr 93 14:59:03 GMT
From: newsgate.watson.ibm.com!yktnews.watson.ibm.com!watson!@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Rich Man's Packet ... : -)
To: packet-radio@ucsd.edu

In <734345121.AA00794@his.com> whitten@f716.n109.z1.his.com (whitten) writes:
stuff deleted.....
>The fastest "off the shelf" solution I've been able to locate are
>the Kantronics UHF data radios which do 19.2k. Clearly not
>56k, but you can buy all the pieces complete and you don't
>have to have a bench full of test equipment to get it working. ;)
>
>Oh well, someone, please tell me there is a better/faster solution.

   I'm leaning in this direction too. $350 seems a bit steep for a 10
watt crystal rig. (If anyone know where to get them for less, PLEASE
let me know.) I believe that these radios will talk to each other at
19.2kb with out a modem OR you can use a 9600b modem running at 19.2kb.
   Can someone with some VHF radio design knowledge explain what's so
hard/expensive in designing a high-speed capable radio? To go at 9600B

and higher, you have to bypass a lot of circuitry that is used for voice communications and can't be used for packet. How come it seems like its more expensive to not include the voice stuff, than it is to include the voice circuitry? Why can't we design a $50 high speed packet rig? If this is an ignorant question, please enlighten me.

   For modems, I call G3RUH sending out a message saying that his modem's were capable of going up to 64kb. It's curious that I haven't heard anything else about that. I know that the standard, G3RUH modems will do 19.2KB and higher. Both PacComm and MFJ use G3RUH designed modems, so they'll go > 9600b.

   Lastly, I recall someone saying that they were running the D4-10 rigs at 38.4kb. I'd like to know if you can use a G3RUH modem running at 38.4kb with the D4-10. Do any mods need to be made to the D4-10? If anyone has any details on that, please let us know.

73's de Jack - kf5mg
AX25net   - kf5mg@kf5mg.#dfw.tx.usa.na - (817) 962-4409
AMPRnet   - kf5mg@kf5mg.ampr.org   - 44.28.0.14
Internet   - kf5mg@vnet.ibm.com

Date: Fri, 9 Apr 1993 16:03:28 GMT
From: haven.umd.edu!darwin.sura.net!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!cs.utexas.edu!utnut!nott!cunews!news@ames.arpa
Subject: Rich Man's Packet ... : -)
To: packet-radio@ucsd.edu

In article <734345121.AA00794@his.com> whitten@f716.n109.z1.his.com (whitten) writes:
>
>I had the same question as the original poster, but after reading
>about the GRAPES modems, I don't think they're really for anyone
>except those interested in tinkering and designing the modems.
>I think it was ve3jf's article that described all the problems
>in finding suitable transverters, the need to build/buy/find
>bandpass filters for the front of these, the susceptibility
>of the transverters to noise from other nearby equipment, ect, ect.
>The fastest "off the shelf" solution I've been able to locate are
>the Kantronics UHF data radios which do 19.2k. Clearly not
>56k, but you can buy all the pieces complete and you don't
>have to have a bench full of test equipment to get it working. ;)
>
>Oh well, someone, please tell me there is a better/faster solution.
>
>Regards,
>Chris

Well, ok, the wa4dsy modem is not plug n play, but let's ease up on the
"bench full of test equipment" claim. I got mine going in in about 3
or 4 evenings - including building it - with just a scope. I'd be
surprised if most people in the hobby don't at least have access to
a scope. More importantly, once built and aligned they are rock solid,
no adjustments have been needed on any of ours, which have been in service
for years.

Transverters are another story I suppose. Too bad Sinclabs got out of the
business. I heard that a small Toronto company was going to resume production
of that design, but I haven't heard more yet.

Dave

--
Dave Perry | Any opinions stated here are mine
dp@hydra.carleton.ca | and have nothing to do with Carleton University
ve3ifb@ve3jf.#eon.on.noam |

Date: 9 Apr 93 17:26:59 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: Shareware for the MFJ1278
To: packet-radio@ucsd.edu

Try lan-link. It can be FTP'd from ucsd.edu.

73 Joe G3ZCZ

Date: 10 Apr 93 01:53:13 GMT
From: usc!cs.utexas.edu!utnut!nott!dgbt!dgbt.doc.ca!barry@network.UCSD.EDU
To: packet-radio@ucsd.edu

References <6977@bacon.IMSI.COM>, <1993Apr8.075140.2001@ke4zv.uucp>,
<1993Apr8.175510.48991@kuhub.cc.ukans.edu>
Subject : Re: Rich Man's Packet ... : -)

In <1993Apr8.175510.48991@kuhub.cc.ukans.edu> whitten@kuhub.cc.ukans.edu writes:

>In article <1993Apr8.075140.2001@ke4zv.uucp>, gary@ke4zv.uucp (Gary Coffman)
writes:
>>
>> You need a GRAPES 56 kb RF modem and a transverter. The modem is an
>> RF design using MSK that outputs on 29 MHz. You use a transverter

>> to kick that to the UHF band of choice. Occupied bandwidth at 56 kb
>> is 70 kHz. There are 100 kHz wide channels on 222 and 440 in the

>I had the same question as the original poster, but after reading
>about the GRAPES modems, I don't think they're really for anyone
>except those interested in tinkering and designing the modems.
>I think it was ve3jf's article that described all the problems
>in finding suitable transverters, the need to build/buy/find
>bandpass filters for the front of these, the susceptibility
>of the transverters to noise from other nearby equipment, ect, ect.
>The fastest "off the shelf" solution I've been able to locate are
>the Kantronics UHF data radios which do 19.2k. Clearly not
>56k, but you can buy all the pieces complete and you don't
>have to have a bench full of test equipment to get it working. ;)

I don't see how anything I've written on this subject could have given
you this impression! The modem is relatively simple to build, and the
only piece of test equipment needed to tune it up is a dual-channel 'scope.
Construction tends to be time-consuming, since you have to provide the
packaging, inter-board wiring, +/-5V supplies, etc... but it's *not*
difficult. Once you have that done, the rest can be close to plug 'n
play: acquire a transverter (admittedly some of the sources of these have
dried up, but how about Down East Microwave's spiffy new DEM432, available
in wired or kit form?) and a suitable synchronous interface board (I'll
refrain from advertising here :-), lash 'em up, and off you go. Yes, you
may need a frontend bandpass filter, depending on your environment, but
that shouldn't be a show-stopper. It's not a trivial project, but it's not
that tough either... many of us have found the effort to be worthwhile and
rewarding.

Barry VE3JF

--
Barry McLarnon | Internet: barry@dgbt.doc.ca
Communications Research Center | AMPRnet: barry@bbs.ve3jf.ampr.org
Ottawa, Canada K2H 8S2 | PBBSnet: ve3jf@ve3jf.#eon.on.can

End of Packet-Radio Digest V93 #95
****